

State of New Mexico
LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVES

Rick Miera, Vice Chair
Joni Marie Gutierrez
Dianne Miller Hamilton
Mimi Stewart
Thomas E. Swisstack
W. C. "Dub" Williams

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
PH: (505) 986-4591 FAX: (505) 986-4338
<http://legis.state.nm.us/lcs/lesc/lescdefault.asp>

SENATORS

Cynthia Nava, Chair
Gay G. Kernan
Mary Kay Papen
William E. Sharer

ADVISORY

Ray Begaye
William "Ed" Boykin
Kandy Cordova
Roberto J. Gonzales
Jimmie C. Hall
John A. Heaton
Harriet I. Ruiz
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton
Richard D. Vigil
Teresa A. Zanetti

ADVISORY

Vernon D. Asbill
Mark Boitano
Carlos R. Cisneros
Dianna J. Duran
Mary Jane M. Garcia
John Pinto
Leonard Tsosie

D. Pauline Rindone, Ph.D., Director
Frances R. Maestas, Deputy Director



August 9, 2006

MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Education Study Committee

FR: David Harrell

RE: STAFF BRIEF: FRAMEWORK FOR SCHOOLS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT

The workplan for the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) for the 2006 interim includes a presentation on the school improvement framework that the Public Education Department (PED) has implemented to assist schools in the school improvement cycle. Following a similar presentation during the 2005 interim, which focused on an audit that the Legislative Finance Committee (LFC) had conducted of PED's school improvement framework, this presentation will update the school rankings under state and federal law, review the current school improvement framework, and discuss PED's efforts to assist schools in the school improvement cycle.

Issues:

Identifying Schools in Need of Improvement

- Both state law and the federal *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) provide a series of consequences, or sanctions, for schools that fail to make "adequate yearly progress" (AYP), which is a prescribed degree of improvement, primarily in student achievement, that schools are expected to make each year – not only for their entire student populations but also for certain subgroups of students: economically disadvantaged students, major racial or ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and English Language Learners.
- Schools begin to face the series of sanctions after two consecutive years of not making AYP. At that point, a school enters the school improvement cycle with a designation of School Improvement 1. In general, a school remains in the school improvement cycle until it makes AYP for two consecutive years, proceeding through the subsequent stages: School Improvement 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring 1, and Restructuring 2. Attachments 1 and 2 explain this series of consequences in more detail.

- State law also requires a school that has been ranked as needing improvement to submit an improvement plan to PED within 90 days of the school improvement notice, a plan produced after a public meeting “to elicit suggestions from parents and the public on how to improve the public school.”
- On August 1, 2006, PED released the school rankings derived from data during school year 2005-2006. According to PED, a total of 433 public schools in New Mexico failed to make AYP; of that total, 349 received designations as schools in the school improvement cycle:
 - School Improvement 1 – 140 schools;
 - School Improvement 2 – 110 schools;
 - Corrective Action – 33 schools;
 - Restructuring 1 – 15 schools; and
 - Restructuring 2 – 51 schools.

In all cases but Restructuring 1, the numbers have increased since school year 2004-2005, when a total of 416 schools failed to make AYP and 236 were placed at one point or another in the school improvement cycle.

Finally, PED reports that 10 schools made AYP for a second consecutive year, meaning that they have emerged from the school improvement cycle altogether.

Assisting Schools in Need of Improvement: The PED School Improvement Framework

- Of the 236 schools that received NCLB designations for school year 2005-2006, PED further identified 80 priority schools that were in the greatest need for academic improvement, either because they did not meet AYP in the “All Students” category in reading and/or math or because they were in Restructuring 2 (see Attachment 3).
- Since the presentation to the LESC in October 2005, PED staff members have been working with these 80 schools through sites visits and diagnostic assessment reports.
 - These reports are intended to document a school’s activities and progress in a number of areas, among them the organizational management system, short-cycle assessments, the student learning environment, and the schools’ Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS).
 - These reports also document the school’s response to the PED mandates applicable to the school’s stage in the school improvement cycle.
 - According to the data released on August 1, of those 80 priority schools from school year 2005-2006, 12 made AYP and one, Laguna-Acoma Middle School, in Grants-Cibola County Schools, emerged from the school improvement cycle because it made AYP for a second consecutive year.

- The PED School Improvement Framework for school year 2006-2007 is a refinement of previous frameworks to reflect a shift in focus from “identification, diagnostic assessment and technical assistance to a broader scope of building capacity at the district level.”
 - To build this capacity, the framework emphasizes a number of interventions: regional leadership training sessions in the Baldrige model of continuous improvement, professional development in instructional delivery for mathematics, technical assistance conferences devoted to strengthening the EPSS, requiring districts to offer teachers and principals professional development in a number of suggested areas, emphasizing the statutory requirement that all schools have – and use – advisory councils, and identifying specific areas of district-level administrative leadership.
 - In addition, the framework enumerates mandates for each of the five stages in the school improvement cycle. All five stages require such actions as individualized student goals/action plans, alignment of the district budget with the applicable NCLB requirements, and a revision of the EPSS “to emphasize priorities that address student learning needs.”
 - Beyond these common mandates, schools at School Improvement 2 must “pursue the hiring of highly qualified teachers in level 2 and level 3 licensure”; and schools in Restructuring 1 or Restructuring 2 must have at least as many highly qualified teachers as the district average, and they may not employ a first-year principal.
 - The PED School Improvement Framework also includes a rewards and advocacy program to allow for “recognition of schools making significant student performance gains regardless of their NCLB designation.”
 - Under this plan, if a school shows a 3.0 percent increase in the number of students at proficiency in both reading and math or if it posts a proficiency rate of 75 percent in both reading and math, it is considered a “Performing School” and it is eligible for a certificate or plaque of recognition and a monetary reward, based upon the availability of funds from the appropriation for the School Improvement Framework (see “Assisting Schools in Need of Improvement: State and Federal Funding,” below).
 - In addition, schools that make AYP for two consecutive years and emerge from the school improvement cycle are considered “Schools on the Rise,” and they, too, are eligible for a certificate or plaque and a monetary reward, again based upon the availability of funds.
 - Another prominent feature of the School Improvement Framework for school year 2006-2007 is the Alternative Governance Contingency Plan, required by November 1, 2006 of every school at Restructuring 1 or Restructuring 2 (see attachments 1 and 2). Using a template provided by PED, the district must develop a plan for implementing one of the following options:
 1. replace all or most of the staff (which may include the principal) who are relevant to the failure to make AYP;
 2. contract with an organization (perhaps a state university, but, pursuant to state law, not a private entity) with a demonstrated record of effectiveness to operate the school;

3. turn over the operation of the school to the state, if the state agrees; or
 4. perform any other major restructuring of a school's governance arrangement that makes fundamental reforms, such as significant changes in the school's staffing or governance, to improve student academic achievement and that has substantial promise of enabling the school to make AYP.
- Three points about these restructuring options might be noted here.
1. The list excludes conversion to a charter school, which is one of the options authorized under both state and federal law, because, through amendments from the 2006 session scheduled to go into effect on July 1, 2007, conversion charter schools will not be allowed after July 1.
 2. Option 2 – contracting with another organization to operate the school – is not specifically authorized under state law. The federal NCLB does allow it, including operation by private entities; state law, however, does not provide a similar option – although it does expressly prohibit a school in corrective action from contracting with a private entity to operate the school.
 3. Option 3 – turning over the operation of the school to the state – is unlikely to be exercised very often. PED has acknowledged a limited “physical capacity of education administrators and teachers” to take over the operation of the number of schools that will be in Restructuring 2.
- In April 2006 PED issued a request for proposals (RFP) for a contractor to provide professional development services in support of the current PED School Improvement Framework.
 - The RFP emphasizes Baldrige systems training and the PED Plan-Do-Study-Act Improvement Cycle.
 - It also specifically requires professional development in mathematics, based on the state Curriculum Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Standards. There is no similar requirement for professional development in reading or language arts, however, because, according to PED, such a requirement would have exceeded a manageable scope. Instead, professional development in those subjects will be handled at the district level in accordance with certain PED mandates.
 - Another feature of the RFP is a requirement that the contractor “provide data collection and data analysis of the effectiveness of all professional development services provided at multiple levels and from multiple sources” to satisfy a variety of requirements.
 - Among other school improvement initiatives that PED is pursuing are grants to selected districts to extend students' time in school by at least three hours per week, a focus on reading instruction during site visits by PED staff to schools in need of improvement, and a reliance upon Teach for America participants in certain areas of the state.
 - Finally, one point that emerged from the LFC audit and the presentation during the 2005 interim was that certain state and federal requirements had not been implemented.

- Despite requirements in both state and federal law, PED had adopted in its school improvement framework for that year a policy to delay any restructuring of schools through a one-year moratorium, during which PED would initiate corrective action and decrease the authority of a Restructuring 2 school that meets all of these three criteria:
 - failure to make AYP in the All Students category in either math or reading;
 - completion of two years of prescribed intervention by PED; and
 - failure to show a 3.0 percent increase at the Proficiency Level on the New Mexico Standards-based Assessment for Reading and Math in the All Students category.
- For the School Improvement Framework for school year 2006-2007, PED has rescinded those three criteria, having found that they do not comply with NCLB, which requires restructuring of any Title I school in Restructuring 2 regardless of the reasons for not making AYP.
- Even so, the current School Improvement Framework postpones for yet another year any actual restructuring, describing school year 2006-2007 as “a contingency planning year for district administration to articulate the steps to be taken to provide educational services to those students impacted” by the restructuring of their school. As it did in school year 2005-2006, PED has taken the position that its interventions and other mandates satisfy NCLB requirements.
- On this point, the Education Commission of the States has found that, throughout the country, “states vary widely in interpreting their role in school restructuring.”

Assisting Schools in Need of Improvement: State and Federal Funding

- As one means of providing assistance to public schools in need of improvement, the 2003 Legislature created the Schools in Need of Improvement Fund, to be administered by PED. However, the Legislature did not provide an appropriation to the fund in FY 04, FY 05, or FY 06 based on information from PED that federal funds would be available each year to meet those needs.
- According to PED, the state has received these amounts of federal Title I school improvement funds (dollar amounts rounded up): \$1.96 million for school year 2003-2004; \$4.36 million for school year 2004-2005; and \$2.55 million for school year 2005-2006. Attachment 4 illustrates the distribution of federal money from this fund for school year 2005-2006.
- Although initial indications suggested that the state would receive far less in federal Title I funds for school year 2006-2007, the final calculations show a substantial increase, with an award amount of nearly \$4.27 million.
- For FY 07, the Legislature appropriated a total of \$8.4 million: \$2.4 million in recurring funds for the Schools in Need of Improvement Fund (some of which PED will use for the grants to extend time in school) and another \$6.0 million in nonrecurring funds for the School Improvement Framework (some of which PED will use for the rewards noted above).

- With the state and federal appropriations combined, PED will have more than \$12.6 million for school improvement efforts in school year 2006-2007.
- However, the disbursement of federal funds may be affected by a recent development regarding New Mexico's student assessment system.
 - In May and again in June 2006, the New Mexico Secretary of Public Education, like her counterpart in a number of other states, received notice from the US Department of Education (USDE) that the state's assessment system does not meet "all the statutory and regulatory requirements" of NCLB. Of particular concern are the state's alternate assessments, both those in Spanish and those for special education students.
 - As a result, the June 2006 letter states, "the current status of the New Mexico standards and assessment system is Approval Pending"; and New Mexico is placed under "Mandatory Oversight." This status places conditions on the state's receipt of the fiscal year 2006 Title I, Part A grant award and requires the state, beginning in September 2006, to file bi-monthly reports on its progress in implementing a compliance plan. Failure to meet the timeline in the plan may prompt the USDE to withhold up to 15 percent of New Mexico's fiscal year 2006 Title I, Part A administrative funds and send those funds instead to school districts.

Background:

- In general, to meet AYP a school must not only show the prescribed degree of improvement for students overall and for each of the subgroups but also demonstrate that at least 95 percent of the students in each group were tested. Other factors, pursuant to state law, include graduation rates for high schools and attendance rates for elementary and middle schools.
- NCLB requires each state to develop its own definition of AYP, based primarily upon academic indicators, particularly student performance on tests of reading or language arts and math. State law defines AYP as "the measure adopted by the [Public Education Department] based on federal requirements to assess the progress that a student, a public school or school district or the state makes toward improving student achievement." The PED rule defines AYP as "the percent of students that must be proficient from year to year within a subject area, grade, whole group and subgroup as specified by state defined annual measurable objectives." This rule further specifies that criterion-referenced tests are the basis for measuring AYP (effective since school year 2004-2005).
- In addition to approving a school's improvement plan, as noted above, state law requires PED to provide an application process by which schools in need of improvement may request financial or other assistance. In evaluating these applications, PED may recommend changes to an application or the improvement plan. Also, the department must "consider innovative methods to assist the public school in meeting its improvement plan, including department or other school employees to serve as a mobile assistance team to provide administrative, classroom, human resource and other assistance to the public school that needs improvement . . . as provided in applications approved by the department."

Presenters:

For this presentation:

Dr. Veronica C. García, Secretary of Public Education, and Ms. Sally Wilkinson, Program Manager, Priority Schools Bureau, PED, will provide an overview of the department's School Improvement Framework 2006-2007, identify some of the school improvement strategies being employed, discuss the RFP for professional development, and explain the assistance that PED has provided to the priority schools; and

Dr. Linda Besett, Superintendent, Central Consolidated Schools, and Ms. Barbara Vigil-Lowder, Superintendent, Bernalillo Public Schools, will discuss the alternative governance plans that they are preparing for schools in their districts at the Restructuring 1 or Restructuring 2 stage in the school improvement cycle; and they will discuss the assistance that their respective districts have received from PED.

Questions the committee may wish to consider:

1. Why are the number of schools not making AYP and the number of schools in the school improvement cycle increasing each year?
2. What is the likelihood that New Mexico's students will reach 100 percent proficiency in math and reading by the NCLB target date of 2014?
3. What evidence is there that Baldrige training for school personnel will lead to improved student performance and the school's making AYP?
4. In what ways have local communities been involved in school improvement activities of their districts?
5. If a school district considers the replacement of all or most of the school staff as its alternative governance contingency plan, how will the district determine which staff "are relevant to the failure" to make AYP?
6. Because the 2006 amendments to the *1999 Charter Schools Act* prohibit conversion charter schools after July 1, 2007, should that provision be amended to correspond with state and federal law, both of which include conversion to a charter school as an option for schools facing restructuring?
7. How will the professional development contractor selected through the RFP coordinate activities with the other professional development providers to ensure comprehensive provision of services and to avoid duplication of efforts?
8. What role will the new PED Mathematics and Science Bureau play in professional development geared toward helping schools make AYP?
9. What is the status of the compliance plan that PED must file with USDE as a result of the mandatory oversight of the state's assessment system? When does PED expect the assessment system to gain full approval from USDE?

10. In what ways might the Title I funds that the state expects to receive for school year 2006-2007 be affected? What is the expected dollar amount of the administrative funds that may be in jeopardy?

**SCHEDULE OF EVENTS FOR SCHOOLS THAT DO NOT MAKE ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS
THROUGH CONSECUTIVE SCHOOL YEARS**

Note: If a school in the school improvement cycle achieves AYP for one year, it retains its ranking for a "delay" year. If it achieves AYP for two years, it leaves the school improvement cycle. If not, it moves to the next step in the cycle.

School Year	NCLB Ranking/ State Designation	Action Required per NCLB	Action Required per State Law
SY 1	1 st Year of Not Making AYP	[none]	[none]
SY 2	2 nd Year of Not Making AYP	[none]	[none]
SY 3	1 st Year of School Improvement/ School Improvement I	School must develop an improvement plan; Local education agency (LEA, that is, the school district) must provide technical assistance (TA); and All students must be offered public school choice, that is, the option of transferring to a higher performing school.	School and district must prepare an improvement plan, which the district submits to PED; School applies to PED for financial or other assistance per improvement plan; and Public school must provide or pay for transportation, within available funds, for students who transfer to a higher ranked school.
SY 4	2 nd Year of School Improvement/ School Improvement II	In addition to the earlier measures: LEA must offer supplemental educational services (SES) to low-income students.	In addition to the earlier measures: Public school must provide supplemental educational services, within available funds.
SY 5	Corrective Action/[same]	In addition to the earlier measures, LEA must do one or more of following: Replace school staff responsible for school's not meeting AYP; Implement new curriculum; Decrease management authority at the school level; Appoint outside expert to advise the school; Extend the school day or year; or Change the school's internal organizational structure.	In addition to the earlier measures, the school district, together with PED, must: Replace staff as allowed by law; Implement a new curriculum; Decrease management authority of the school; Appoint an outside expert to manage the school; Extend the school day or year; <u>or</u> Change the school's internal organizational structure.
SY 6	Restructuring/Restructuring I	In addition to the earlier measures, LEA must prepare a plan and arrange to: Reopen the school as a charter school; Replace the principal and staff; Contract with a private management company of demonstrated effectiveness; Submit the school to state takeover; <u>or</u> Conduct any other major restructuring of the school's governance.	In addition to the earlier measures, school district, together with PED, must: Reopen the public school as a charter school; Replace all or most of the staff as allowed by law; Turn over management of the school to PED; <u>or</u> Make other governance changes.
SY 7	Implementation of Restructuring/Restructuring II	Alternative governance plan (from the preceding year) must be implemented by the first day of school.	

AYP AND SCHOOL SANCTIONS

- Schools begin to face the series of sanctions after two consecutive years of not making AYP (see Attachment 1, SY 3, School Improvement I). At that point, a school enters the school improvement cycle as a school in need of improvement. Among other actions, a school in its first year of school improvement, together with the district, must (1) develop an improvement plan and submit it to PED for approval and (2) provide or pay for transportation, within available funds, for students who exercise their option of transferring to a higher ranked school.
- After three consecutive years of not making AYP (SY 4 in Attachment 1, School Improvement II), a school must provide its students with supplemental educational services, including after-school programs, tutoring, and summer services, within available funds. In each case – transfer to another school and supplemental educational services – state law requires PED to adopt rules governing the priority for students for whom these costs will be paid. (Under NCLB, if there is sufficient demand, the district must spend a minimum of 5.0 percent of its Title I allocation for transportation of students exercising their transfer option or for supplemental educational services; however, the district may not spend more than 20 percent of its allocation on either one or both of these services combined.)
- Under both state and federal law, after the fourth consecutive year of not making AYP (SY 5 in Attachment 1, Corrective Action), the school must take one or more of the following corrective actions, in addition to the preceding measures: replace school staff, implement a new curriculum, decrease management authority at the school level, appoint an outside expert to advise the school, extend the school day or year, or change the school's internal organizational structure.
- Under both state and federal law, after the fifth consecutive year of not meeting AYP, the school enters the restructuring phase, either by planning to restructure (SY 6 in Attachment 1, Restructuring I) or implementing the planned restructuring (SY 7 in Attachment 1, Restructuring II) through one of the following actions: reopening as a charter school, replacing all or most of the school staff, conducting a major restructuring of the school's governance, or submitting to state takeover. For restructuring, NCLB contains two provisions not found in state law: an additional year for planning (which state law accommodates) and the additional option of having a school contract with a private management firm (which state law prohibits).

First Year Implementation Review-DAR-SCHOOL SITE VISITS - PED EPSS COORDINATORS- PARTNERS -2005-2006

School	District Location	Educational Associates	PHONE Number	Group	NCLB Category	PED EPSS LIAISON	Site Visits	PED EPSS Coordinator
17 Schools (R2-Phase II)								
Washington MS	Albuquerque	Rick Sulewski	419-239-1801	JSA	R2-Phase II	Phyllis Martinez	4/3/2006	Eric Spencer
Santo Domingo MS	Bernalillo	Denise Woody	505-249-7041	JSA	R2-Phase II	Phyllis Martinez	5/3/2006	Claudia Alstrom
Mesa ES	Central Cons.			JSA	R2-Phase II	Phyllis Martinez	4/6/2006	Dan Farley
Tse'Bit'AI MS	Central Cons.	Denise Woody	505-249-7041	JSA	R2-Phase II	Phyllis Martinez	4/21/2006	Gabriel Baca
Cuba HS	Cuba	Rick Sulewski	419-239-1801	JSA	R2-Phase II	Phyllis Martinez	4/6/2006	Pat Concannon
Dulce ES	Dulce	Cay Moore	505-259-5598	JSA	R2-Phase II	Phyllis Martinez	4/6/2006	Diana Jaramillo
Espanola MS	Espanola	Denise Woody	505-249-7041	JSA	R2-Phase II	Phyllis Martinez		Michelle Le Maire
Tony Quintana-Som.ES	Espanola	Denise Woody	505-249-7041	JSA	R2-Phase II	Phyllis Martinez	3/31/2006	Diana Bateman
ChurchRock Academy	Gallup	Cay Moore	505-259-5598	JSA	R2-Phase II	Cynthia Clarke	3/7/2006	Vicky Breen
David Skeet ES	Gallup	Cay Moore	505-259-5598	JSA	R2-Phase II	Cynthia Clarke	3/22/2006	Larry Martinez
John F. Kennedy MS	Gallup	Cay Moore	505-259-5598	JSA	R2-Phase II	Cynthia Clarke	3/22/2006	Pam Sutcliffe
Navajo ES	Gallup	Marty Moore	812-498-5618	JSA	R2-Phase II	Cynthia Clarke	4/17/2006	Marjorie Gillespie
Thoreau MS	Gallup	Carole McGurk	727-510-9593	JSA	R2-Phase II	Cynthia Clarke	4/11/2006	Patrick Werito
Tobe Turpen ES	Gallup	Cheryl Kmiecik	414-581-5861	JSA	R2-Phase II	Tom Lewis	4/20/2006	Carolyn Henderson
Tohatchi HS	Gallup	Marty Moore	812-498-5618	JSA	R2-Phase II	Cynthia Clarke	4/11/2006	John Moore
Laguna Acoma MS	Grants	Carole McGurk	727-510-9593	JSA	R2-Phase II	Phyllis Martinez	4/4/2006	Barbara Alvarez
Zuni MS	Zuni	Cheryl Kmiecik	414-581-5861	JSA	R2-Phase II	Larry Bemdesderfer	3/23/2006	Andrew Rendon
10 Schools (R2)								
Ernie Pyle MS	District Location	Ed. Associates		Group	NCLB Category	LIAISON	Site Visit	PED EPSS Coord.
Lavaland ES	Albuquerque	Carlos Romero	505-275-6403	GBEEs	R2-Phase I	Elaine Manicke		Kris Baca
Polk MS	Albuquerque	Glen Walters		GBEEs	R2-Phase I	Elaine Manicke	4/19/2006	Jennifer Rodgers
Truman MS	Albuquerque	Vicki Kay	505-265-1948	GBEEs	R2-Phase I	Elaine Manicke	3/23/2006	Arlene Romero
Valle Vista Es	Albuquerque	Virginia Trujillo	505-242-7306#18	GBEEs	R2-Phase I	Elaine Manicke	4/25/2006	Robert Romero
Chee Dodge ES	Albuquerque	Marlene Parra	505-642-3772	GBEEs	R2-Phase I	Elaine Manicke	4/19/2006	Kathryn Sherlock
Rocky View ES	Gallup	Laurel Moore	505-845-9955	GBEEs	R2-Phase I	Cynthia Clarke	3/28/2006	Deloria Chappo
Stagecoach ES	Gallup	Cherie Curtin	505-845-7881	GBEEs	R2-Phase I	Cynthia Clarke	4/13/2006	Edmund Lano
Desert View IS	Gallup	Don Silva	505-821-8568	GBEEs	R2-Phase I	Larry Bemdesderfer	4/14/2006	Vern Bla
Edward Ortiz MS	Los Lunas	Patsy Neely	505-792-0528	Re-Learning	R2-Phase I	Paula McGee	4/11/2006	Patricia Hackney
12 Schools (R1)								
Harrison MS	District Location	Ed. Associates		Group	NCLB Category	LIAISON	Site Visit	PED EPSS Coord.
Naschitti ES	Albuquerque	Nancy Davenport	505-463-3320	JSA	PS-R1	Elaine Manicke		Bernadette Gomez
Newcomb MS	Central Cons.	Ruth Miller	505-845-7881	GBEEs	R1	Larry Bemdesderfer	4/19/2006	Richard La Pan
Nizhoni ES	Central Cons.	Celia Merrill	505-268-5337	Golden Apple	R1	Larry Bemdesderfer	4/27/2006	Daniel Benavidez
Alcalde ES	Central Cons.	Betty Souther	505-330-3653	GBEEs	R1	Larry Bemdesderfer	4/18/2006	Karen Ehler
Carlos Vigil MS	Espanola	Carlos Pagan	505-890-4030	NorthernNtwk	R1	Adrian Cordova	4/4/2006	Rose Sherman
Espanola HS	Espanola	Carlos Pagan	505-890-4030	NorthernNtwk	R1	Adrian Cordova	4/18/2006	Julia Rosa Emslie
Crownpoint ES	Espanola	Carlos Pagan	505-890-4030	NorthernNtwk	R1	Adrian Cordova	4/18 or 19/05	Nora Lovato
Tohatchi ES	Gallup	Jim Fawver	505-792-0528	GBEEs	R1	Larry Bemdesderfer	4/27/2006	Adrian Sandoval
Tohatchi MS	Gallup	Patricia Cloud	505-467-2555	Re-Learning	R1	Adrian Cordova		Duane Ellis
Twin Lakes ES	Gallup	Susie Bussman	505-646-1650	RETA	R1	Adrian Cordova	4/21/2006	Larry Bemdesderfer
Agua Fria ES	Gallup	Patricia Cloud	505-467-2555	Re-Learning	R1	Adrian Cordova	4/18/2006	Liza Rael
6 Schools (CA)								
	District Location	Ed. Associates		Group	NCLB Category	LIAISON	Site Visit	PED EPSS Coord.
	Santa Fe	Cheryl Kmiecik	414-581-5861	JSA	PS-R1	Margaret Garza	4/13/2006	Adrian Cordova

Carlos Rey ES	Albuquerque	Karen Edwards	505-250-3123	JSA	CA	Elaine Manicke	5/8/2006	Cynthia Cantou-Clarke
Cuba ES	Cuba	Nadine Torres	505-239-6777	JSA	CA	Larry Bernesderfer	4/18/2006	Kate Sydney
Lybrook ES	Jemez Mountain	Cheryl Kmiecik	414-581-5861	JSA	CA	Margaret Garza	4/27/2006	Alicia Benavidez
San Diego Riverside Ch.	Jemez Valley	Nadine Torres	505-239-6777	JSA	CA	Phyllis Martinez		Wilma Martinez
Ojo Caliente ES	Mesa Vista	Nadine Torres	505-239-6777	JSA	CA	Tom Lewis	4/10/2006	Catherine Collins
Twin Buttes HS	Zuni	Janelle Gates	512-699-3687	JSA	CA	Adrian Cordova	4/21/2006	Margaret Garza
10 schools (S12)	District Location	Ed. Associates		Group	NCLB Category	LIAISON	Site Visit	PED EPSS Coord.
Robert F. Kennedy Ch	Albuquerque	Nancy Davenport	505-463-3320	JSA	PS-S12	Elaine Manicke		Michelle Lewis
Career Prep HS	Central Cons.	Nadine Torres	505-239-6777	JSA	PS-S12	Paula McGee	4/5/2006	James Hetler
Rocinante HS	Farmington	Carole McGurk	727-510-9593	JSA	PS-S12	Paula McGee	4/4/2006	Dwayne Lehman
Gallup Central Alt.HS	Gallup	Janelle Gates	512-699-3687	JSA	PS-S12	Tom Lewis	4/13/2006	Georgia Glasgow
Jemez Valley ES	Jemez Valley	Nadine Torres	505-239-6777	JSA	PS-S12	Margaret Garza	4/27/2006	Paula McGee
San Andres HS	Las Cruces	Rick Sulewski	419-239-1801	JSA	PS-S12	Adrian Cordova	4/12/2006	Phyllis Martinez
Century Alt.	Los Lunas	Janelle Gates	512-699-3687	JSA	PS-S12	Margaret Garza	4/5/2006	Jennifer Sallee
Mora MS	Mora	Nadine Torres	505-239-6777	JSA	PS-S12	Paula McGee	4/6/2006	Phyllis Martinez
Broad Horizons Alt	Portales	Janelle Gates	512-699-3687	JSA	PS-S12	Margaret Garza	4/26/2006	Tom Lewis
University HS	Roswell	Janelle Gates	512-699-3687	JSA	PS-S12	Margaret Garza	4/17/2006	Elaine Manicke
25 Schools (S11)	District Location	Ed. Associates		Group	NCLB Category	LIAISON	Site Visit	PED EPSS Coord.
AcademiaDeLengCht	Albuquerque	Danielle Johnston	505-281-7400	NMCSA	S11	Jennifer Sallee	4/21/2006	Corina Chavez
Alb.Evening HS	Albuquerque	Patricia Latham	800-247-4269	CESDP	S11	Jennifer Sallee	4/17/2006	Derek Irion
Charter Voc. HS	Albuquerque	Nora Yazzie	800-247-4269	CESDP	S11	Jennifer Sallee	4/26/2006	Corina Chavez
Eubank ES	Albuquerque	Cheryl Brown-Kovacic	800-247-4269	CESDP	S11	Jennifer Sallee	4/5/2006	Andrea Hamilton
La AcademiaDeEspCht	Albuquerque	Satya Brown	505-856-0841	GBEEs	S11	Jennifer Sallee	4/17/2006	Ellen Moore
Los Puentes Charter	Albuquerque	Cynde Gustke	800-247-4269	CESDP	S11	Jennifer Sallee	4/20/2006	Ellen Moore
Rio Grande HS	Albuquerque	JJ Parsons	505-923-8512	GBEEs	S11	Jennifer Sallee	4/21/2006	Teresa Chaparro
School on Wheels Alt	Albuquerque	Cheryl Brown-Kovacic	800-247-4269	CESDP	S11	Jennifer Sallee	3/20/2006	Vonell Huitt
West Mesa HS	Albuquerque	Patricia Latham	800-247-4269	NMCSA	S11	Jennifer Sallee	4/13/2006	Bill Blair
Nuestros Valores Cht	Albuquerque	Rudy Chavez	505-747-7238	CESDP	S11	Elaine Manicke	4/20/2006	Wilma Martinez
Belen Infinity HS	Belen	Donald Dugas	505-647-8728	Re-Learning	S11	Paula McGee		Iona Leriou
Columbus ES	Deming	Donald Dugas	505-647-8728	Re-Learning	S11	Larry Bernesderfer	3/23/2006	Art Martinez
Deming MS	Deming	Cathe North	505-894-7589	REC 10	S11	Larry Bernesderfer	4/18/2006	Phil Baca
Desert Pride Academy	Gadsden	Donald Dugas	505-647-8728	Re-Learning	S11	Tom Lewis	4/13/2006	Jesus Reveles
Navajo MS	Gallup	Alicia Hatch	505-356-6681	GBEEs	S11	Tom Lewis	3/29/2006	Julie Garcia
Mariposa ES	Los Lunas	Patsy Neely	505-258-1989	Re-Learning	S11	Paula McGee	4/19/2006	Cathy Adams
Raymond Gabaldon IS	Los Lunas	Patsy Neely	505-258-1989	Re-Learning	S11	Paula McGee	4/18/2006	Daniel Williams
New Hope Alt. HS	Lovington	Susie Bussman	505-646-1650	RETA	S11	Tom Lewis	3/13/2006	Jo Beth Hawk
Capital HS	Santa Fe	Paula Papponi	505-896-0531	NCA	S11	Tom Lewis	4/10/2006	Sue Gronewold
Ramirez Thomas ES	Santa Fe	Tamara Lopez	505-747-2224	RETA	S11	Tom Lewis	4/27/2006	Dean Hopper
NM School for the Deaf	State School	Marcia Brenden	505-747-7238	CESDP	S11	Paula McGee	4/25/2006	Donna Grein
NM School for Vis-Imp	State School	Carole Brito	800-247-4269	CESDP	S11	Paula McGee		Brad Parker
Zuni HS	Zuni	Eric Romero	505-747-7238	CESDP	S11	Margaret Garza	3/23/2006	Robert Olix
Zuni IS	Zuni	Kay Tenorio	505-877-4257	NCA	S11	Margaret Garza	3/23/2006	Gerald Pitzl
Total- 80 Schools								

LEGEND: JSA:Jim Shipley & Assoc.; Re-Learning:Re-Learning NM; NorthernNM: Northern New Mexico Rural Ed. Network; REC: Regional Education Coop.; CESDP:Center for Ed &Study of Diverse Populations; GBEE's:SQS;NMCSA-NMCoalition of School Adm.

District	School	Award	Grand Total
Albuquerque	Academia de Lengua Y Cultura Charter School	\$28,400	
	Carlos Rey ES	\$28,400	
	Ernie Pyle MS	\$28,400	
	Eubank ES	\$28,400	
	Harrison MS	\$45,000	
	Harrison MS	\$28,400	
	La Academia de Esperanza Charter School	\$28,400	
	Lavaland ES	\$45,000	
	Los Puentes Charter School	\$28,400	
	Nuestros Valores Charter School	\$28,400	
	Polk MS	\$28,400	
	Rio Grande HS	\$28,400	
	Robert F. Kennedy Charter School	\$28,400	
	Truman MS	\$45,000	
	Valle Vista ES	\$45,000	
	Washington MS	\$45,000	
	West Mesa HS	\$28,400	\$565,800
Belen Bernalillo Central	Belen Infinity HS	\$28,400	\$28,400
	Santo Domingo MS	\$45,000	\$45,000
	Career Prep HS	\$28,400	
	Mesa ES	\$28,400	
	Naschitti ES	\$45,000	
	Newcomb MS	\$45,000	
	Nizhoni ES	\$45,000	
	Tse'Bit'AI MS	\$28,400	\$220,200
Cuba	Cuba ES	\$28,400	
	Cuba HS	\$45,000	\$73,400
Deming	Columbus ES	\$28,400	
	Deming MS	\$28,400	\$56,800
Dulce Espanola	Dulce ES	\$45,000	\$45,000
	Alcalde ES	\$45,000	
	Espanola MS	\$45,000	
	Tony Quintana-Sombrillo ES	\$45,000	\$135,000
Farmington	Rocinante HS	\$28,400	\$28,400
	Desert Pride Academy	\$28,400	\$28,400
Gadsden Gallup	Chee Dodge ES	\$45,000	
	ChurchRock Academy	\$45,000	
	Crownpoint ES	\$45,000	
	David Skeet ES	\$45,000	
	Gallup Central Alternative HS	\$28,400	
	John F. Kennedy MS	\$45,000	
	Navajo ES	\$45,000	
	Navajo MS	\$28,400	
	Rocky View ES	\$45,000	
	Stagecoach ES	\$45,000	
	Thoreau MS	\$45,000	
	Tobe Turpen ES	\$28,400	
	Tohatchi ES	\$45,000	
	Tohatchi HS	\$28,400	
	Tohatchi MS	\$45,000	
	Twin Lakes ES	\$45,000	\$653,600

2005-06 Title I School Improvement Awards

District	School	Award	Grand Total
Grants	Laguna Acoma MS	\$28,400	\$28,400
Hatch	Ace Alternative HS	\$28,400	\$28,400
Jemez Mountain	Lybrook ES	\$28,400	\$28,400
Jemez Valley	Jemez Valley ES	\$28,400	
	San Diego Riverside Charter School	\$28,400	\$56,800
Las Cruces	San Andres HS	\$28,400	\$28,400
Los Lunas	Century Alternative	\$28,400	
	Desert View Intermediate	\$28,400	
	Mariposa ES	\$28,400	
	Raymond Gabaldon ES	\$28,400	\$113,600
Mesa Vista	Ojo Caliente ES	\$28,400	\$28,400
Mora	Mora MS	\$28,400	\$28,400
Portales	Broad Horizons Alternative	\$28,400	\$28,400
Roswell	University HS	\$28,400	\$28,400
Santa Fe	Agua Fria ES	\$45,000	
	Agua Fria ES	\$28,400	
	Edward Ortiz MS	\$45,000	
	Ramirez Thomas ES	\$28,400	\$146,800
Zuni	Twin Buttes HS	\$28,400	
	Zuni HS	\$28,400	
	Zuni IS	\$28,400	
	Zuni MS	\$45,000	\$130,200
TOTAL		\$2,554,600	\$2,554,600